

Application No. 10/606,039

B. AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

A new amended drawing has been provided in response to the Examiner's observations.

Fig. 11A has been amended by removing the "22-1" identifier number.

Application No. 10/605,039

C. REMARKS

Claims 40-95 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 40-95 are cancelled, and new claims 96-106 are added. No new matter has been introduced by way of the added claims.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview on February 3, 2005. During the interview each independent claim was discussed in light of the prior art, consistent with the remarks below.

Specification

The Examiner's objections to page 9, line 19 of the specification and to Fig. 11^A have been addressed through respective amendments thereto. Namely, the specification has been amended to clarify a reference to Fig. 5G, rather than 5C, for the particular embodiment described beginning on page 9, line 19.

The Examiner further objects that "reference numeral 22 has been used with more than one term." Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. Specifically, only the connector structure provided at the free end of the screen is identified with reference numeral "22." The Applicant merely uses language such as "attachment member," "connection member" and similar terms interchangeably to identify this same connector structure.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the above-referenced objections.

Application No. 10/655,039

Drawings

The Examiner's objection with regard to Fig. 11A is noted and an amended figure is submitted with this response.

35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 49, 56, 57 and 59-62 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph, as "failing to comply with the enablement requirement." Specifically, the Examiner stated that "the structure or means which enables the screen to be replaced in the tracks is not adequately disclosed. Also, the L-shaped connection member has not been adequately disclosed." The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections on the grounds stated below. While the rejected claims have been cancelled and new claims added, Applicant will address the Examiner's enablement rejections as terminology, such as "L-shaped" connector, is present in certain new claims now pending – *i.e.*, claims 97 and 102.

First, the structure and method of tracking and re-tracking the screen within the respective tracks, in accordance with at least one embodiment of the invention, are depicted in Figs. 6A-6C, and described on page 9, line 25 through page 10, line 20 of the present application. Secondly, exemplary embodiments of L-shaped connectors are depicted in Figs. 11A-F, with descriptions of the embodiment of these figures provided on page 11, line 23 through page 12, line 5, as well as page 12, lines 10-17. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above-referenced rejections as enabling disclosure has been provided in accordance with 35 USC § 112.

Application No. 10/605,039

35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 40-58 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph, as "being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." Specifically, claim 40 has been rejected as being "ambiguous since a 'free end' has been previously recited and the fabric has two ends." In light of the cancellation of claims 40-58, the rejection is rendered moot and further discussion of this rejection is not required.

35 USC § 102(a) - Kavchar

Claims 40-42, 44, 59 and 62 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by 6,116,321 to Kavchar. While the rejected claims have been cancelled and new claims are pending, Applicant will, nevertheless, address Kavchar to demonstrate that the reference fails to teach or suggest the invention presented in the newly added claims.

First, Kavchar fails to teach or suggest "opposed screen edge portions substantially free of any support element whereby said screen presents a minimal profile when said screen is retracted onto said roller assembly" as required in independent claims 96 and 101. Second, Kavchar, as a horizontally positioned RV window, does not teach or suggest "first and second jambs, header and sill presenting a door frame adapted for hingedly mounting along one of said jambs for pivotal shifting between a door open and door closed position" as required in claims 96 and 101. Similarly, the horizontal window of Kavchar does not teach or suggest "a door insert operably vertically movable along a generally vertical door insert path of travel between an insert raised position and an insert lowered position, the weight of said door insert urging said insert

Application No. 10/606,039

towards said lowered position" as required in claims 96 and 101. Unlike Kavchar, the weight of the door and the biasing element of claim 96 cooperatively place "tension on said screen such that said screen edge portions are generally retained between respective screen engaging elements, notwithstanding said screen edge portions being substantially free of any support element." Further, and unlike Kavchar, the door insert of claim 101 includes "a one piece interface element for operably, detachably interconnecting said insert and said screen," comprising "channel structure defining a channel adapted to operably fixedly receive said insert" and "an engagement element integral with said channel structure, said engagement element presenting an abutment surface for abutably, operably detachably engaging said screen attachment element." As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above-referenced rejections under 35 USC § 102(a).

35 USC § 102(b) – Johnson

Claims 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-55, 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by 3,244,222 to Johnson. While the rejected claims have been cancelled and new claims are pending, Applicant will, nevertheless, address Johnson to demonstrate that the reference fails to teach or suggest the invention presented in the newly added claims.

First, Johnson does not teach or suggest "respective screen engaging element operably generally fixedly carried by each of said first and second screen tracks" as required in claims 96 and 101. In fact, Johnson teaches away from such generally fixed screen engaging elements by instead requiring the use of locking means (103, 110) that rotate in and out of the frames (112, 114) by moving rams (113) for engagement with the screen only after the screen is pulled into

Application No. 10/615,039

position. See Johnson, Col. 3, lines 37-54. Similarly, Johnson fails to teach or suggest a portion of the screen end “extending into said screen tracks” as required by claims 96 and 101. Again, Johnson teaches away from such structure as the rotating locking means “extend the height of the opening 14 in the door.” Id., Col. 3, lines 47-49. The inclusion of an end portion extending into the frames (112, 114) of Johnson would prevent the rotating protrusions (109, 111) of the locking means (103, 110) from rotating into position with the screen along the length of the opening. Further, and unlike Johnson, the door of claim 96 includes a spline connector “to provide lengthwise operable slidable coupling of said screen end portion with said coupling mechanism.” As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above-referenced rejections under 35 USC § 102(b).

35 USC § 103(a) – Johnson

Claims 43, 47-48 and 50 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(b) as being obvious over 3,244,222 to Johnson. In view of the newly presented claims and the foregoing explanation of the patentability of the claims over Johnson, these rejections are rendered moot and further discussion is not required. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above-referenced rejections under 35 USC § 103(a).

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 40, 49 and 59 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of US Patent No. 6,618,998 (“the ‘998 Patent”). Given the addition of newly added claims 96-106, this rejection is moot as each of the

Application No. 10/605,039


claims are patentably distinct over the '998 Patent claims. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above-referenced double patenting rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



James H. Patterson
Registration No. 30,673

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5741